Jide & Gingras, P.C. 425 G Street, Suite 930 Anchorage, Alaska 99501 (907) 279-0930 telephone (907) 279-0933 fax

IN THE UNITED STATES	DISTRICT	COURT

FOR THE DISTRICT OF ALASKA

TOR THE DISTRICT OF ALASKA		
THE UNITED STATES for the use of)	
GMW Fire Protection, Inc., an Alaska		
Corporation,)	
•)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
VS.)	
)	
KANAG'IQ CONSTRUCTION CO.,)	
INC., an Alaska Corporation, and		
WESTERN SURETY COMPANY, a		
South Dakota Corporation,)	
-		
Defendants.) Case No. A05-170 CI (TMB)	

REPLY TO PLAINTIFF'S OPPOSITION TO MOTION TO STRIKE

Defendants, KANAG'IQ CONSTRUCTION CO., INC. and WESTERN SURETY COMPANY, through their counsel, Eide & Gingras, P.C., reply to Plaintiff's Opposition to Motion to Strike. As a preliminary matter, the settlement proposal at issue makes clear on its face that it was intended as a confidential settlement proposal: "As a settlement offer, it is not admissible in evidence for *any* purpose." [Plaintiff's Exhibit A; emphasis added] GMW completely fails to address this issue in its opposition. GMW's effort to admit the letter into evidence at all is inappropriate and unsupported under the circumstances.

Moreover, Federal Rule of Evidence 408 prohibits the use of offers to compromise when offered to prove the invalidity or amount of a claim that was disputed as to validity or amount. Fed. R. Evid. 408(a)(2). This, however, is precisely what GMW is doing.

Reply to Plaintiff's Opposition to Motion to Strike *The United States for the use of GMW Fire Protection v. Kanag'Iq Construction Co., Inc., et al.* Case No. A05-170 Civil (TMB)

Page 1 of 3

6

4

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

(907) 279-0933 fax

Eide & Gingras, P.C. Anchorage, Alaska 99501

23

22

24

By its own admission, GMW states: "The letter was offered to show that Kanag'Iq used unreasonable counterclaims to avoid paying GMW's legitimate claims. . . . " [Opposition, Rule 408 prohibits this: in offering the letter, GMW attempts to show that p. 21 Kanag'Iq's counterclaims were invalid (unreasonable), and that its claims were valid (legitimate) for purposes of an award of attorney's fees.

Even if evidence of settlement negotiations may sometimes be relied upon in setting a reasonable fee award, GMW mischaracterizes the evidence here:

. . . [T]he obvious intent and purpose of [Kanag'Iq's] unfair trade practices claim was to threaten GMW with the treble damages provisions in order to encourage GMW to drop its legitimate claims, as was evidenced by the fact that Kanag'Iq's only settlement offers, throughout, were that GMW pay Kanag'Iq [See Exhibit A] or that the parties "walk away."

[Plaintiff's Reply to Response to Supplemental Briefing Re Attorney Fees, p. 2] First, Kanag'Iq did not bring any of the counterclaims to "threaten" GMW, and the Court stated at oral argument that the counterclaims were not frivolous. Second, Exhibit A and GMW's reference above to other settlement offers by Kanag'Iq, also inadmissible, do not provide evidence of threat as GMW alleges. There is no logical connection between the settlement offer(s) and GMW's mischaracterization of the claims and counterclaims. The parties simply differed in their views of the case, which is why it went to trial.

GMW's use of the letter in this matter is not permissible in light of the letter's express confidentiality provision, GMW's stated reason for offering the evidence, and Rule 408. GMW's submission is not permitted under the rule. Moreover, courts do not necessarily deem the consideration of settlement negotiations proper to establish an award

of attorney's fees. See Fair Housing Council of San Diego v. Penasquitos Casablanca 1 Owner's Assoc., 523 F.Supp.2d 1164, 1175 (S.D.Cal. 2007) (the court declined to consider 2 settlement related communications in reaching its decision regarding attorney's fees). 3 4 Kanag'Iq respectfully requests the Court to strike any part of GMW's opposition that 5 references settlement negotiations, including Exhibit A, and to impose whatever sanctions 6 it deems appropriate. 7 DATED at Anchorage, Alaska this 29th day of May, 2008. 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE I am a legal secretary employed by the law 18 firm of Eide & Gingras, P.C. That on this 29th day of May, 2008, I served 19 [x] Electronically 20 a true and accurate copy of the foregoing document upon the following counsel of record: 21 Sarah J. Tugman, Esq. 2509 Eide Street, Suite 4 Anchorage, AK 99503 22 EIDE & GINGRAS, P.C. 23 By /s/Donna Charter 24 F:\431\05\Motion to Strike Settlement Letter Reply.DOC 25

EIDE & GINGRAS, P.C. Attorneys for Defendants Kanag'Iq Construction Co., Inc. and Western Surety Company

By:___ s/Thomas S. Gingras Thomas S. Gingras 425 G Street, Suite 930 Anchorage, AK 99501 Phone: (907) 279-0930 (907) 279-0933 Fax:

E-mail: tsgingras@egpalaska.com

Alaska Bar No. 7811098

Anchorage, Alaska 99501 (907) 279-0930 telephone (907) 279-0933 fax

Eide & Gingras, P.C.

Reply to Plaintiff's Opposition to Motion to Strike

Page 3 of 3

The United States for the use of GMW Fire Protection v. Kanag'Iq Construction Co., Inc., et al. Case No. A05-170 Civil (TMB)